

Applicant : Peter Wiedemuth et al.
Serial No. : 10/743,345
Filed : December 23, 2003
Page : 14 of 19

Attorney's Docket No.: 15540-0019001 / 25951;
18.00381; DS08541

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 3-52 are pending, with claims 1, 14, 22, 23, 24, 34, 40, 41, and 42 being independent. Claim 52 has been added. Support for the amendments and new claim 52 can be found, for example, in the specification at least at page 5, line 21 to page 6, line 3.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant acknowledges the Examiner's indication that claims 14, 22, 23, 34, 40, and 41 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Applicant has rewritten claims 14, 22, 23, 34, 40, and 41 in independent form, and therefore these claims should be in condition for allowance.

Drawings

The drawings have been objected to for not showing a plasma load of a gas discharge application. Applicant requests withdrawal of this objection because applicant has deleted the language regarding the plasma load from the body of claim 42, which is the only pending claim that recited the plasma load, and for at least this reason, the drawings comply with 37 CFR §1.83.

Claim Objections

Applicant has amended claims 6 and 26 to address the objection to these claims. Accordingly, applicant requests withdrawal of this objection.

Claim Rejections

Claims 1, 4, 6-10, and 16 have been rejected as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,211,581 (Farrant). Applicant requests withdrawal of this rejection because Farrant does not describe or suggest a current supply unit having separate and distinct current supply modules each having its own control receptacle, where the current supply modules are connected such that the current supply unit has a single output connection that provides a maximum output

power that is greater than the maximum output power of its individual current supply modules, as recited in independent claim 1.

Farrant discloses a remotely controlled power bar 14 that allows outlets 18 to be switched through a remote control unit. The remote control unit 22 shown in the implementation of FIGS. 1-5 includes switches 32 and a master switch 36 that are switched on and off to control current to the respective outlet 18 to provide electricity to an electric device connected to one of the outlets 18. See Farrant at col. 3, lines 44-57; col. 4, lines 41-65; and FIG. 6. In FIG. 21, Farrant describes a power bar unit 10 that also includes a USB hub 30 with USB receptacles 60, each able to connect to the remote control unit 22 through a cable 29 or 67. For example, the remote control unit 22 can be on a keyboard 45 or a PC 42. See Farrant at col. 7, lines 15-33 and FIG. 21.

In FIG. 21, the outlets 18 are controlled by the remote control unit 22, which in this case, is at the keyboard 45, and the control from the remote control unit 22 to the outlets 18 is provided through the USB hub 30, the receptacle 60, and through some additional control circuitry that is internal to the power bar unit 10 to enable the control of the switching of the AC power source 54 (which is supplied by plug 12 at the power bar unit 10, and which is unlabeled in FIG. 21) to each and every outlet 18. Although a single receptacle 60 is arranged below each of the outlets 18 in FIG. 21, Farrant does not disclose the existence of a module that includes the receptacle 60 and one of the outlets 18 that is separate and distinct from one of the other receptacles 60 and outlets 18. Instead, each of the receptacles 60 is used to control all of the outlets 18 through the control circuitry that is internal to the power bar unit 10 and is shared by all outlets 18. Indeed, the outlet 18 and the USB receptacle 60 are not a current supply “module” because they do not act together as a module that is separate and distinct from any other combination of an outlet 18 and a USB receptacle 60.

Moreover, Farrant never describes or suggests that the maximum output power of the power bar unit 10 is greater than the maximum output power of its individual outlets 18. In particular, Farrant never suggests that the power bar unit 10 has a single output connection that provides a maximum output power. Rather, Farrant’s power bar unit 10 is designed to provide output powers at each of the outlets 18, not to provide a single output power. And, even if there was such a combined output power (which applicant does not concede is even proper to assume

since Farrant's invention relates to providing outputs at each of the outlets 18), there is nothing in Farrant that suggests that the maximum output power of all of the outlets 18 is greater than the maximum output power of a single outlet 18. See Farrant at FIG. 6. The Office appears to allege with respect to Farrant's outlets 18 that a parallel connection of the outlets would provide a maximum output power that is greater than the maximum output power of a single outlet. However, Farrant does not describe or suggest that the outlets 18 are connected together in any fashion. Rather, Farrant describes that each of the outlets 18 is used to provide power to separate devices. See Farrant at col. 1, lines 17-28.

Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable over Farrant, as are dependent claims 4, 6-10, and 16.

Claims 3, 5, 11-13, 15, 17-21, 24-33, 35-39, and 42-48 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Farrant in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,616,968 (Fujii), U.S. Publication No. 2004/0000815 (Pereira), and U.S. Patent No. 5,828,356 (Stoller). Applicant requests withdrawal of this rejection for the following reasons.

Claims 3, 5, 11-13, 15, and 17-21 depend from claim 1, which was rejected as being anticipated by Farrant. As discussed above, Farrant fails to describe or suggest a current supply unit having separate and distinct current supply modules each having its own control receptacle, where the current supply modules are connected such that each current supply unit has a single output connection that provides a maximum output power that is greater than the maximum output power of its individual current supply modules, as recited in independent claim 1.

Moreover, Fujii, Pereira, and Stoller do not remedy the failure of Farrant to describe or suggest a current supply unit having separate and distinct current supply modules each having its own control receptacle, and it would not have been obvious to modify Farrant based on the teachings of Fujii, Pereira, and Stoller.

In particular, Fujii discloses an expandable AC power supply device 2, which includes an AC power supply plug 5, switches 8 and 11, a battery 12, a booster 13, an inverter 14 to supply energy when power outage occurs, and an AC output terminal 9. See Fujii at col. 3, line 59 – col. 4, line 9 and Fig. 1(b). Each power supply device 2 includes its own control unit 15 that controls the switches 8 and 11, the battery 12, the booster 13, and the inverter 14. See Fujii at col. 4, lines 4-9 and FIG. 1(b). The switches 8 and 11 control the connection between the AC output terminal 9 to either the battery 12 or to the AC power supply plug 5. See Fujii at col. 3,

lines 50-65. Fujii discloses further that each AC power supply device 2 can function as an independent power supply. See Fujii at col. 3, lines 27-20. Thus, even if multiple AC power supply devices 2 are combined, each AC power supply device 2 is still controlled by its own control unit 15.

Moreover, Fujii fails to describe or suggest a “control receptacle” into which Fujii’s control unit 15 is plugged or that the control unit 15 is “movable” to other AC power supply devices 2.

Further, applicant could not find any disclosure of those features in Pereira, which the Office has cited for its disclosure of a switching cabinet, and Stoller, which the Office has cited for its disclosure of a plasma television.

Moreover, it would not have been obvious to modify Farrant to provide for separate and distinct current supply modules, each having its own control receptacle, because such a modification would require a substantial redesign of Farrant’s power bar unit 10 and would vitiate the integral and shared design of Farrant’s power bar unit 10. As Farrant explains and demonstrates, the power bar unit 10 is designed with an internal control circuitry that is shared among the outlets 18 and is specifically designed to be implemented in a single power bar unit 10 that is coupled to the AC power source 54. There is nothing separate or distinct about this design. See Farrant at FIG. 6, for example.

Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable over any proper combination of Farrant, Fujii, Pereira, and Stoller. Dependent claims 3, 5, 11-13, 15, and 17-21 are allowable for at least the reasons that claim 1 is allowable.

Claim 24 recites essentially the same features as claim 1 with respect to the above presented arguments 1, except that claim 24 recites a power converter module instead of a current supply module. This does not affect the arguments presented above for claim 1, which are therefore equally valid for claim 24.

Accordingly, applicant requests withdrawal of the rejection of claims 24-33 and 35-39 because, as discussed above, neither Farrant, Fujii, Pereira, Stoller, nor any proper combination of the four describes or suggests a current supply unit comprising separate and distinct power converter modules each having its own control receptacle, where the power converter modules are connected such the current supply unit has a maximum output power that is greater than the

maximum output power of its individual power converter modules, as recited in independent claims 24. Accordingly, claim 24 is allowable over these references, as are dependent claims 25-33 and 35-39.

Applicant requests withdrawal of the rejection of claims 42-48 because, as discussed above, neither Farrant, Fujii, Pereira, Stoller, nor any proper combination of the four describes or suggests a current supply unit having separate and distinct current supply modules each having its own control receptacle, where the current supply modules are connected such the current supply unit has a maximum output power that is greater than the maximum output power of its individual current supply modules, as recited in independent claim 42. Accordingly, claim 42 is allowable over these references, as are dependent claims 43-48.

New Claim 52

New claim 52 recites that the control unit and the first current supply module form a master current supply module that includes a connection between the control unit and the first current supply module for controlling the first current supply module through the control unit, and the control unit when moved to another of the control receptacles of the other current supply modules of the current supply unit forms a master current supply module with that current supply module. None of the cited reference discloses that plugging a control unit into a control receptacle of one of the current supply modules forms a master current supply module.

Accordingly, applicant respectfully submits that claim 52 is allowable.

Applicant : Peter Wiedemuth et al.
Serial No. : 10/743,345
Filed : December 23, 2003
Page : 19 of 19

Attorney's Docket No.: 15540-0019001 / 25951;
18.00381; DS08541

In conclusion, applicant submits that all claims are in condition for allowance, which action is requested. The fees for excess claims (\$1,260.00) and the Two Month Extension of Time (\$460.00) are being paid concurrently with the Electronic Filing System (EFS). Please apply any other charges or credits, to deposit account 06 1050, referencing Attorney Docket No. 15540-0019001.

Respectfully submitted,

Date:September 29, 2008

/Diana DiBerardino/

Diana DiBerardino
Reg. No. 45,653

Fish & Richardson P.C.
1425 K Street, N.W.
11th Floor
Washington, DC 20005-3500
Telephone: (202) 783-5070
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331

30450274.doc